

NEW YORK OFFICE, 56 WORTH STREET.

THE

BOSTON OFFICE, 21 FRANKLIN STREET.

MARTIN-BROWNING

Exclusively Wholesale Dealers In

DRY GOODS, NOTIONS, FURNISHING GOODS, BOOTS, SHOES AND HATS

FORT WORTH, TEXAS.

W. F. LAKE

Wholesale Dealer in

HARDWARE, STOVES AND TINWARE

Queensware, Crockery and Glassware,

COR. SECOND AND HOUSTON STREETS, FORT WORTH, TEXAS.

H. W. WILLIAMS & CO.,

(Successors to L. N. Brunswick & Co.)

WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS

and Dealers in

Druggists' Sundries, Show Cases

And Fixtures, Paints, Oils, and almost everything usually kept in a Drug Store.

Bottom Prices.

FORT WORTH, TEXAS.

FORT WORTH CHINA COMPANY

Wholesale

Queensware, China and Glassware

401 HOUSTON ST., CORNER THIRD.

A DAY AT DALLAS.

Death of a Prominent and Well Known Railroad Man.

Cammack Confined in a Cell—The Rise in Insurance Rates.

Extension of the Texas Trunk by Eastern Capitalists.

Special to the Gazette.

Dallas, April 14.—James A. Trumbull, for years a well-known railroad man, died at Sherman last night. Deceased at the time of his death was travelling freight agent of the Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio road, headquarters at Dallas. He had been in active railroad service in Texas for many years, and was one of the best known and most popular and competent men in the business. Mr. Trumbull, in 1871, secured the right of way for the Houston & Texas Central railroad between Dallas and Denison, and later was station agent for that road at Sherman, but three years ago severed his connection with that corporation and connected himself with the Star & Crescent route, remaining with it ever since. He was a native of Ohio, came South previous to the war, served in the Confederate army with credit and gallantry, and at the close took up railroading as his permanent profession.

A squad of the Fourth regular cavalry passed through Dallas last night en route from New York for service in New Mexico.

Hamilton, the champion jumper of the world, has been in Dallas, under an alias, the past week, laying for a "soft snap," under the coaching of the local sporting fraternity. He failed to make a "scoop" match and has departed for some other portion of the state.

W. F. Cummings, the geologist, departed to-night for the Comanche reservation in the Indian territory, to make scientific researches in unexplored regions of the Wichita mountains for the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia.

The following delegation from the Pontiac and Ocoila tribes, Independent Order of Red Men, Shreveport, Louisiana, arrived to-day: Hon. M. C. Eilsner, W. T. Fleming, John C. Bacon, Hon. M. S. Crane, Samuel Dreyfus, to institute the Haymakers association in Caddo tribe, No. 8, Dallas, to-night. The delegation was met by Messrs. W. D. Wylie, J. S. Thatcher and William Jenkinson, and escorted to the vicarwan. They tarry in the city two days.

In the district court to-day Judge Aldridge refused to allow R. B. Seay to be reinstated on the bond on which Morgan Cammack was released before the latter made his recent famous trip to Mexico, and on which Mr. Seay surrendered him before his return and incarceration in Dallas jail. Cammack was this evening removed from his comfortable quarters set apart for state witnesses in the jail and is now occupying a cell with the common prisoners. County Attorney Clint proposes, if it is possible under the law, to prosecute Cammack with the other members of the cotton fraud ring, maintaining that he has forfeited all claim to the state's clemency. Mr. Seay informed the GAZETTE correspondent that he would endeavor to have Cammack released on his original bond of \$7,500 secured by bondsmen and \$7,500 by his personal recognizance—arguing that the prisoner had not forfeited his bond; that it was only the act of a bondsman surrendering him, and that new proceedings on new bonds were not necessary.

County Attorney Clint views the matter differently, and this evening filed the following document with the district clerk:

State of Texas vs. Morgan Cammack—District court Dallas county, A. D. 1884: And now comes the county attorney in the above entitled cause, and represents to the court that heretofore, to wit, on or about the 23d day of March, A. D. 1884, and about three days after Morgan Cammack had given bond and been released from custody he fled the country and went to Old Mexico, and his bondsmen, R. B. Seay, becoming apprehensive about his return, procured, in conjunction with the sheriff hereof, W. H. W. Smith, our sheriff to go to El Paso, on his way to secure the return of the said Cammack, preparatory to securing the services of the said Smith, made affidavit, under the statute in such cases made and provided, to give the said Cammack up and be released from off his bonds; but afterwards, to-wit, on the 8th day of April, the said Cammack was arrested on a capias which issued in one of the cases on which said Seay was bondsman, and said Cammack was arrested thereon, and is now in the Dallas county jail. The county attorney avers that he does not believe that the bond as at present fixed will be sufficient in the event the said Cammack again attempts to give bail to secure his appearance and attendance on this court; wherefore, he prays that the said Cammack's bail be raised to such an amount as the thirty-one cases on which he stands indicted in this court.

CHARLES F. CLINT, County Attorney.

The cases against E. D. Easton, the former agent of the Missouri Pacific Railroad company at San Caman, were to-day passed in the district court and set for April 23th. The cases against Baum and Lubenstein were set for Monday, April 21st.

William Womack, injured by a Texas & Pacific train early Sunday morning, and who lost his arm amputated yesterday, died in the city hospital to-day.

The Dallas County Medical association have appointed Doctors J. L. Carter, R. W. Allen and R. H. Chilton delegates to the meeting of the State Medical association at Belton on April 22.

There is a pretty well authenticated rumor here to-day that Morgan, Draxel & Co., with other eastern capitalists, have arranged for the purchase of the Texas Trunk railroad, and will soon extend it three hundred miles, two hundred miles in the direction of Sabine Pass, and one hundred miles northwest from Dallas. Upwards of half a million dollars in cash bonuses will be secured if this is done.

Dr. J. C. Miehener, formerly of Iowa, died to-day at his home near Hutchinson. He was one of the most respected citizens of Dallas county. He had resided here five years. His remains are to be taken to Adel, Iowa.

J. H. Curry, formerly a well-known Baptist minister at Dallas and St. Louis, is in the city.

The delegates to-night instituted Haymaker a society of Caddo tribe, No. 8, Dallas.

Lewis Bishop, for assault with intent to kill, sentenced to two years, and Frank McLaughlin, for horse stealing, sentenced to five years, passed to-day on route to Huntsville penitentiary from Mitchell county.

TEXAS AND LOUISIANA.

Spicy Correspondence Between Gov. Ireland and Gov. McEnery.

Rights and Duties of the States Under the Extradition Clause.

Tilt for Tat—We Are But Children of a Larger Growth.

Special to the Gazette.

Austin, April 14.—The following correspondence has passed between Governor Ireland, of Texas, and Governor McEnery, of Louisiana, relative to Governor McEnery's refusal to issue a warrant for the man Carroll, who was wanted in Texas for taking out of that state mortgaged personal property, a civil offense, but no crime under the laws of Louisiana:

GOVERNOR IRELAND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1884.

To His Excellency Samuel D. McEnery, Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.:

Sir—On the 7th day of March, 1884, I issued requisition directed to you, Excellency, requesting the return of Carroll to this state, he being a fugitive from justice.

On the 30th ultimo the requisition was re-issued to this office, bearing the following remarkable endorsement: "Respectfully declined, as the laws of the state are unknown to the office, and there is no affidavit accompanying the application that return of the fugitive is for the purpose of substantial justice and not for the purpose of holding him liable in a civil process to which he is liable."

First—The fact the offense charged is not known to the criminal laws of the state whose executive is requested to surrender a fugitive, is given as a reason for declining to surrender him at least new and novel. It was supposed necessary only to be satisfied that the offense charged was really an offense against the laws of the state making the requisition.

Second—Your second reason for your refusal is an impeachment of the law officers of the grand jury, the judge, who presided when the indictment was returned into court, and the executive of the state. Here is a requisition, accompanied by a duly certified copy of the bill of indictment, and yet your declination is based upon the ground that this state and her officials have not purged themselves of and made proof of an absence of possible disgraceful attempt to use the criminal machinery of this and a sister state for the purpose of collecting a debt without the slightest proof or fact tending to show that these suspicions are well founded.

I am not aware of anything in the past history of this state that justifies the suspicions or your course in this matter. Laws may be promulgated here as they are in all civilized nations, but they have not and will not be prostituted by the consent and connivance of the government itself. You had the undoubted power, physically, to decline to honor the requisition, but you have not the legal or moral right to so decline. States recognizing their common obligation to the Federal Union, are legally and morally bound to surrender fugitives when a legal demand is made for them. That you can be compelled to obey this legal and moral obligation was erroneously so decided in Kentucky vs. Denison. It is not an unreasonable supposition that had your excellency desired to learn whether the offense charged in the indictment was really a legal charge, that you could readily have done so by reference to the code of laws of this state. By turning to the revised statutes of Texas, you could have seen and readily found, by the use of an excellent index, that 103 of the criminal code of that book, and at 767, that the offense charged was a felony. If you have not a copy of our laws, it will afford me much pleasure to furnish the state of Louisiana to ascertain whether the offense charged was one known to the laws of Louisiana is not perceived—whether that question was solved in the one way or the other could have no possible bearing on the question. It is not inappropriate to allude here to a telegram from your excellency of date March 31st, and some action in the case here discussed, telling me that there was a prisoner in jail in Terrell, in this state, for whom you had issued a requisition on the governor of Texas, and requesting me to order the sheriff of Kaufman county to hold until your requisition reached this state. In answer, I wired you this morning that, since your action in the main case here discussed, I was not inclined to usurp extraordinary powers. Under the laws and form of government, the governor of Texas has no authority to order a sheriff to do anything. He may request, and often does, but never to violate the laws. In your case, under different conditions, I would have taken great pleasure in requesting a sheriff to go to the verge of authority on your application, but I am now so pardoned for declining and expressing my profound astonishment and regret at the course you have seen proper to pursue.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, JNO IRELAND, Governor of Texas.

GOV. McENERY'S REPLY.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, BATON ROUGE, LA., APRIL 13, 1884.

His Excellency John Ireland, Governor of Texas.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst. I had previously received your dispatch relating to your action in the case of the fugitive murderer, Clarke, who, for the purpose of robbery, assassinated two aged people, John G. Rogers and his wife, in the parish of Ouachita.

It was with more regret than displeasure that I read the dispatch, and not knowing the circumstances attending its transmission, I had hoped that in due time an expression of some regret would follow it. I would take no embrace of your letter were there not embraced therein several charges which I think are unwarranted and which require notice.

1. Carroll was charged with taking out of the state of Texas mortgaged personal property. This is no offense or crime in the state of Louisiana, and in declining, under respectful terms, the request, I obeyed the laws of Louisiana. (Section 1617, Revised Statutes of Louisiana.)

2. With reference to the endorsement relating to holding him liable to a civil process, I will state that I had no intention whatever of being disrespectful to your excellency, or of being injurious to you. The bill of the grand jury who found the bill of the judge who presided, any more than the judges of Ohio, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Iowa, Massachusetts and other states who have adopted rules,

TEXAS AND LOUISIANA.

Spicy Correspondence Between Gov. Ireland and Gov. McEnery.

Rights and Duties of the States Under the Extradition Clause.

Tilt for Tat—We Are But Children of a Larger Growth.

Special to the Gazette.

Austin, April 14.—The following correspondence has passed between Governor Ireland, of Texas, and Governor McEnery, of Louisiana, relative to Governor McEnery's refusal to issue a warrant for the man Carroll, who was wanted in Texas for taking out of that state mortgaged personal property, a civil offense, but no crime under the laws of Louisiana:

GOVERNOR IRELAND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1884.

To His Excellency Samuel D. McEnery, Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.:

Sir—On the 7th day of March, 1884, I issued requisition directed to you, Excellency, requesting the return of Carroll to this state, he being a fugitive from justice.

On the 30th ultimo the requisition was re-issued to this office, bearing the following remarkable endorsement: "Respectfully declined, as the laws of the state are unknown to the office, and there is no affidavit accompanying the application that return of the fugitive is for the purpose of substantial justice and not for the purpose of holding him liable in a civil process to which he is liable."

First—The fact the offense charged is not known to the criminal laws of the state whose executive is requested to surrender a fugitive, is given as a reason for declining to surrender him at least new and novel. It was supposed necessary only to be satisfied that the offense charged was really an offense against the laws of the state making the requisition.

Second—Your second reason for your refusal is an impeachment of the law officers of the grand jury, the judge, who presided when the indictment was returned into court, and the executive of the state. Here is a requisition, accompanied by a duly certified copy of the bill of indictment, and yet your declination is based upon the ground that this state and her officials have not purged themselves of and made proof of an absence of possible disgraceful attempt to use the criminal machinery of this and a sister state for the purpose of collecting a debt without the slightest proof or fact tending to show that these suspicions are well founded.

I am not aware of anything in the past history of this state that justifies the suspicions or your course in this matter. Laws may be promulgated here as they are in all civilized nations, but they have not and will not be prostituted by the consent and connivance of the government itself. You had the undoubted power, physically, to decline to honor the requisition, but you have not the legal or moral right to so decline. States recognizing their common obligation to the Federal Union, are legally and morally bound to surrender fugitives when a legal demand is made for them. That you can be compelled to obey this legal and moral obligation was erroneously so decided in Kentucky vs. Denison. It is not an unreasonable supposition that had your excellency desired to learn whether the offense charged in the indictment was really a legal charge, that you could readily have done so by reference to the code of laws of this state. By turning to the revised statutes of Texas, you could have seen and readily found, by the use of an excellent index, that 103 of the criminal code of that book, and at 767, that the offense charged was a felony. If you have not a copy of our laws, it will afford me much pleasure to furnish the state of Louisiana to ascertain whether the offense charged was one known to the laws of Louisiana is not perceived—whether that question was solved in the one way or the other could have no possible bearing on the question. It is not inappropriate to allude here to a telegram from your excellency of date March 31st, and some action in the case here discussed, telling me that there was a prisoner in jail in Terrell, in this state, for whom you had issued a requisition on the governor of Texas, and requesting me to order the sheriff of Kaufman county to hold until your requisition reached this state. In answer, I wired you this morning that, since your action in the main case here discussed, I was not inclined to usurp extraordinary powers. Under the laws and form of government, the governor of Texas has no authority to order a sheriff to do anything. He may request, and often does, but never to violate the laws. In your case, under different conditions, I would have taken great pleasure in requesting a sheriff to go to the verge of authority on your application, but I am now so pardoned for declining and expressing my profound astonishment and regret at the course you have seen proper to pursue.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, JNO IRELAND, Governor of Texas.

GOV. McENERY'S REPLY.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, BATON ROUGE, LA., APRIL 13, 1884.

His Excellency John Ireland, Governor of Texas.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst. I had previously received your dispatch relating to your action in the case of the fugitive murderer, Clarke, who, for the purpose of robbery, assassinated two aged people, John G. Rogers and his wife, in the parish of Ouachita.

It was with more regret than displeasure that I read the dispatch, and not knowing the circumstances attending its transmission, I had hoped that in due time an expression of some regret would follow it. I would take no embrace of your letter were there not embraced therein several charges which I think are unwarranted and which require notice.

1. Carroll was charged with taking out of the state of Texas mortgaged personal property. This is no offense or crime in the state of Louisiana, and in declining, under respectful terms, the request, I obeyed the laws of Louisiana. (Section 1617, Revised Statutes of Louisiana.)

2. With reference to the endorsement relating to holding him liable to a civil process, I will state that I had no intention whatever of being disrespectful to your excellency, or of being injurious to you. The bill of the grand jury who found the bill of the judge who presided, any more than the judges of Ohio, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Iowa, Massachusetts and other states who have adopted rules,

TEXAS AND LOUISIANA.

Spicy Correspondence Between Gov. Ireland and Gov. McEnery.

Rights and Duties of the States Under the Extradition Clause.

Tilt for Tat—We Are But Children of a Larger Growth.

Special to the Gazette.

Austin, April 14.—The following correspondence has passed between Governor Ireland, of Texas, and Governor McEnery, of Louisiana, relative to Governor McEnery's refusal to issue a warrant for the man Carroll, who was wanted in Texas for taking out of that state mortgaged personal property, a civil offense, but no crime under the laws of Louisiana:

GOVERNOR IRELAND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1884.

To His Excellency Samuel D. McEnery, Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.:

Sir—On the 7th day of March, 1884, I issued requisition directed to you, Excellency, requesting the return of Carroll to this state, he being a fugitive from justice.

On the 30th ultimo the requisition was re-issued to this office, bearing the following remarkable endorsement: "Respectfully declined, as the laws of the state are unknown to the office, and there is no affidavit accompanying the application that return of the fugitive is for the purpose of substantial justice and not for the purpose of holding him liable in a civil process to which he is liable."

First—The fact the offense charged is not known to the criminal laws of the state whose executive is requested to surrender a fugitive, is given as a reason for declining to surrender him at least new and novel. It was supposed necessary only to be satisfied that the offense charged was really an offense against the laws of the state making the requisition.

Second—Your second reason for your refusal is an impeachment of the law officers of the grand jury, the judge, who presided when the indictment was returned into court, and the executive of the state. Here is a requisition, accompanied by a duly certified copy of the bill of indictment, and yet your declination is based upon the ground that this state and her officials have not purged themselves of and made proof of an absence of possible disgraceful attempt to use the criminal machinery of this and a sister state for the purpose of collecting a debt without the slightest proof or fact tending to show that these suspicions are well founded.

I am not aware of anything in the past history of this state that justifies the suspicions or your course in this matter. Laws may be promulgated here as they are in all civilized nations, but they have not and will not be prostituted by the consent and connivance of the government itself. You had the undoubted power, physically, to decline to honor the requisition, but you have not the legal or moral right to so decline. States recognizing their common obligation to the Federal Union, are legally and morally bound to surrender fugitives when a legal demand is made for them. That you can be compelled to obey this legal and moral obligation was erroneously so decided in Kentucky vs. Denison. It is not an unreasonable supposition that had your excellency desired to learn whether the offense charged in the indictment was really a legal charge, that you could readily have done so by reference to the code of laws of this state. By turning to the revised statutes of Texas, you could have seen and readily found, by the use of an excellent index, that 103 of the criminal code of that book, and at 767, that the offense charged was a felony. If you have not a copy of our laws, it will afford me much pleasure to furnish the state of Louisiana to ascertain whether the offense charged was one known to the laws of Louisiana is not perceived—whether that question was solved in the one way or the other could have no possible bearing on the question. It is not inappropriate to allude here to a telegram from your excellency of date March 31st, and some action in the case here discussed, telling me that there was a prisoner in jail in Terrell, in this state, for whom you had issued a requisition on the governor of Texas, and requesting me to order the sheriff of Kaufman county to hold until your requisition reached this state. In answer, I wired you this morning that, since your action in the main case here discussed, I was not inclined to usurp extraordinary powers. Under the laws and form of government, the governor of Texas has no authority to order a sheriff to do anything. He may request, and often does, but never to violate the laws. In your case, under different conditions, I would have taken great pleasure in requesting a sheriff to go to the verge of authority on your application, but I am now so pardoned for declining and expressing my profound astonishment and regret at the course you have seen proper to pursue.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, JNO IRELAND, Governor of Texas.

GOV. McENERY'S REPLY.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, BATON ROUGE, LA., APRIL 13, 1884.

His Excellency John Ireland, Governor of Texas.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst. I had previously received your dispatch relating to your action in the case of the fugitive murderer, Clarke, who, for the purpose of robbery, assassinated two aged people, John G. Rogers and his wife, in the parish of Ouachita.

It was with more regret than displeasure that I read the dispatch, and not knowing the circumstances attending its transmission, I had hoped that in due time an expression of some regret would follow it. I would take no embrace of your letter were there not embraced therein several charges which I think are unwarranted and which require notice.

1. Carroll was charged with taking out of the state of Texas mortgaged personal property. This is no offense or crime in the state of Louisiana, and in declining, under respectful terms, the request, I obeyed the laws of Louisiana. (Section 1617, Revised Statutes of Louisiana.)

2. With reference to the endorsement relating to holding him liable to a civil process, I will state that I had no intention whatever of being disrespectful to your excellency, or of being injurious to you. The bill of the grand jury who found the bill of the judge who presided, any more than the judges of Ohio, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Iowa, Massachusetts and other states who have adopted rules,

TEXAS AND LOUISIANA.

Spicy Correspondence Between Gov. Ireland and Gov. McEnery.

Rights and Duties of the States Under the Extradition Clause.

Tilt for Tat—We Are But Children of a Larger Growth.

Special to the Gazette.

Austin, April 14.—The following correspondence has passed between Governor Ireland, of Texas, and Governor McEnery, of Louisiana, relative to Governor McEnery's refusal to issue a warrant for the man Carroll, who was wanted in Texas for taking out of that state mortgaged personal property, a civil offense, but no crime under the laws of Louisiana:

GOVERNOR IRELAND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1884.

To His Excellency Samuel D. McEnery, Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.:

Sir—On the 7th day of March, 1884, I issued requisition directed to you, Excellency, requesting the return of Carroll to this state, he being a fugitive from justice.

On the 30th ultimo the requisition was re-issued to this office, bearing the following remarkable endorsement: "Respectfully declined, as the laws of the state are unknown to the office, and there is no affidavit accompanying the application that return of the fugitive is for the purpose of substantial justice and not for the purpose of holding him liable in a civil process to which he is liable."

First—The fact the offense charged is not known to the criminal laws of the state whose executive is requested to surrender a fugitive, is given as a reason for declining to surrender him at least new and novel. It was supposed necessary only to be satisfied that the offense charged was really an offense against the laws of the state making the requisition.

Second—Your second reason for your refusal is an impeachment of the law officers of the grand jury, the judge, who presided when the indictment was returned into court, and the executive of the state. Here is a requisition, accompanied by a duly certified copy of the bill of indictment, and yet your declination is based upon the ground that this state and her officials have not purged themselves of and made proof of an absence of possible disgraceful attempt to use the criminal machinery of this and a sister state for the purpose of collecting a debt without the slightest proof or fact tending to show that these suspicions are well founded.

I am not aware of anything in the past history of this state that justifies the suspicions or your course in this matter. Laws may be promulgated here as they are in all civilized nations, but they have not and will not be prostituted by the consent and connivance of the government itself. You had the undoubted power, physically, to decline to honor the requisition, but you have not the legal or moral right to so decline. States recognizing their common obligation to the Federal Union, are legally and morally bound to surrender fugitives when a legal demand is made for them. That you can be compelled to obey this legal and moral obligation was erroneously so decided in Kentucky vs. Denison. It is not an unreasonable supposition that had your excellency desired to learn whether the offense charged in the indictment was really a legal charge, that you could readily have done so by reference to the code of laws of this state. By turning to the revised statutes of Texas, you could have seen and readily found, by the use of an excellent index, that 103 of the criminal code of that book, and at 767, that the offense charged was a felony. If you have not a copy of our laws, it will afford me much pleasure to furnish the state of Louisiana to ascertain whether the offense charged was one known to the laws of Louisiana is not perceived—whether that question was solved in the one way or the other could have no possible bearing on the question. It is not inappropriate to allude here to a telegram from your excellency of date March 31st, and some action in the case here discussed, telling me that there was a prisoner in jail in Terrell, in this state, for whom you had issued a requisition on the governor of Texas, and requesting me to order the sheriff of Kaufman county to hold until your requisition reached this state. In answer, I wired you this morning that, since your action in the main case here discussed, I was not inclined to usurp extraordinary powers. Under the laws and form of government, the governor of Texas has no authority to order a sheriff to do anything. He may request, and often does, but never to violate the laws. In your case, under different conditions, I would have taken great pleasure in requesting a sheriff to go to the verge of authority on your application, but I am now so pardoned for declining and expressing my profound astonishment and regret at the course you have seen proper to pursue.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, JNO IRELAND, Governor of Texas.

GOV. McENERY'S REPLY.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, BATON ROUGE, LA., APRIL 13, 1884.

His Excellency John Ireland, Governor of Texas.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst. I had previously received your dispatch relating to your action in the case of the fugitive murderer, Clarke, who, for the purpose of robbery, assassinated two aged people, John G. Rogers and his wife, in the parish of Ouachita.

It was with more regret than displeasure that I read the dispatch, and not knowing the circumstances attending its transmission, I had hoped that in due time an expression of some regret would follow it. I would take no embrace of your letter were there not embraced therein several charges which I think are unwarranted and which require notice.

1. Carroll was charged with taking out of the state of Texas mortgaged personal property. This is no offense or crime in the state of Louisiana, and in declining, under respectful terms, the request, I obeyed the laws of Louisiana. (Section 1617, Revised Statutes of Louisiana.)

2. With reference to the endorsement relating to holding him liable to a civil process, I will state that I had no intention whatever of being disrespectful to your excellency, or of being injurious to you. The bill of the grand jury who found the bill of the judge who presided, any more than the judges of Ohio, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Iowa, Massachusetts and other states who have adopted rules,

TEXAS AND LOUISIANA.

Spicy Correspondence Between Gov. Ireland and Gov. McEnery.

Rights and Duties of the States Under the Extradition Clause.

Tilt for Tat—We Are But Children of a Larger Growth.

Special to the Gazette.

Austin, April 14.—The following correspondence has passed between Governor Ireland, of Texas, and Governor McEnery, of Louisiana, relative to Governor McEnery's refusal to issue a warrant for the man Carroll, who was wanted in Texas for taking out of that state mortgaged personal property, a civil offense, but no crime under the laws of Louisiana:

GOVERNOR IRELAND'S LETTER.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, State of Texas, Austin, April 1, 1884.

To His Excellency Samuel D. McEnery, Governor of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.:

Sir—On the 7th day of March, 1884, I issued requisition directed to you, Excellency, requesting the return of Carroll to this state, he being a fugitive from justice.

On the 30th ultimo the requisition was re-issued to this office, bearing the following remarkable endorsement: "Respectfully declined, as the laws of the state are unknown to the office, and there is no affidavit accompanying the application that return of the fugitive is for the purpose of substantial justice and not for the purpose of holding him liable in a civil process to which he is liable."

First—The fact the offense charged is not known to the criminal laws of the state whose executive is requested to surrender a fugitive, is given as a reason for declining to surrender him at least new and novel. It was supposed